Ser. No. 09/719,148
Customer No. 24498

PF980074

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 9,10 and 11 have been amended to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the subject matter added by amendment on January 5, 2007, has been removed and the subject matter of claims 3 and 12 have been added to the independent claims 1, 9 and 10 respectively. Claims 3 and 12 have been cancelled herein. Claims 4 and 11 has been clarified. No new matter is believed to be added by the present amendment.

Rejection to claims 1, 9 and 11 under 35 USC 112, First and Second Paragraphs

It is believed the rejection should refer to claims 1, 9 and 10.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 USC 112 to claims 1, 9 and 11 (10) are moot in view of the removal of the subject matter added by amendment on January 5, 2007.

Rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Claim 11 is rejected as lacking antecedent basis for the first and second devices. It is respectfully submitted claim 11 has been clarified with proper antecedent basis and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-13 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Strecker (US Pat No 4,777,595, hereinafter Strecker)

The subject matter of claim 3 has been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 9. Thus, claims 1 and 9 require:

> "said *connection is opened* by said first device through a *function call* sent to said second device *for writing data* to said second device."
> (*emphasis added*)

Applicant submits that for at least the reasons discussed below, amended claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Strecker.

Ser. No. 09/719,148   . PF980074
Customer No. 24498

On page 7 of the Office Action, in analyzing claim 3, the Examiner argues that col. 5, lines 3-7 of Strecker discloses the subject-matter of former claim 3 (now incorporated into claims 1 and 9). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Col. 5 lines 3-7 of Strecker reads as follows: *"To minimize the number of host interrupts, commands can be generated in the receiving port automatically, responsive to a basic command from the sending port, as in the case of generating a confirmation message or performing a READ operation."* Applicant respectfully submits that Strecker as evidenced in the cited passage, does not disclose or suggest the subject-matter of former claim 3 for at least two reasons.

First, Strecker does not teach or reasonably suggest "said connection is **opened**" as claimed. Strecker only suggests that commands can be generated. These commands can be generated responsive to a basic command from the sending port. However, there is no suggestion or even a hint that the "commands" described in the cited section of the Strecker document cited in the Office Action are related to an **opening** of a connection as particularly recited in applicant's claim 3.

One skilled in the art of Computer Science would recognize that a **function call** is different from a **command.** In computer science, a subroutine (function, method, procedure or subprogram) is a portion of code within a larger program. The subroutine performs a specific task and is relatively independent of the remaining code. The syntax of many programming languages includes support for creating self contained subroutines, and for **calling** and returning from them.

In computing, a **command** is a directive to a computer program acting as an interpreter of some kind, in order to perform a specific task. Most commonly, a command is a directive to some kind of command line interface, such as a shell, (Source: Wikipedia http://www.wikipedia.org).

Simply stated, there is no indication of a **function call** in Strecker as recited by the claims of the present disclosure.

Second, Strecker fails to teach or reasonably suggest *"writing data"* as required by claims 1 and 9 of the present disclosure. For example, claim 1 recites: "said connection is opened by said first device through a function call sent to said second device for writing data to said second device" (emphasis added).

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Strecker fails to teach or reasonably suggest the method as claimed wherein the method requires "said

6

Ser. No. 09/719,148   PF980074
Customer No. 24498

connection is opened by said first device through a *function call* sent to said
second device *for writing data* to said second device." (*emphasis added*)

Because the features of applicant's claims 1 and 9 are not described in
Strecker, the rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant's dependent claims 2 and 4-7
each include the features of claim 1 and additional distinguishing features recited in
each claim.

It is respectfully requested the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9 be withdrawn
and these claims allowed.

Similarly with respect to claims 10-14, the subject matter of claim 12 has been
incorporated into independent claim 10. Thus, claim 10 requires:

> "further comprising the step of *opening a connection* by sending a
> *function call* to said transmitter device for reading data from said
> transmitter device." (*emphasis added*)

Applicant submits that for at least the same reasons discussed above in
connection with amended claims 1 and 9, amended claim 10 and the claims
dependent therefrom are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Strecker.

Specifically, Strecker fails to teach or reasonably suggest "*opening a
connection* by sending a *function call*" as claimed.

Because the features of applicant's claim 10 are not described in Strecker,
the rejection should be withdrawn. Applicant's dependent claims 11 and 13-14 each
include the features of claim 10 and additional distinguishing features recited in each
claim.

**Rejection of claims 8 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Strecker in view of Muller (US Pat No 6,021,132)**

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Strecker in view of Muller et al. (U.S. 6,021,132, hereinafter Muller).

Muller is cited as teaching dynamically allocatable buffers. However, even if
Muller provides such teaching, Muller fails to cure the defect of Strecker as applied
to claims 1 and 10 as discussed above. Thus, applicant submits that claims 8 and
14, which depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively, are patentably distinguishable

7

Ser. No. 09/719,148
Customer No. 24498

PF980074

over the combination of Strecker and Muller for at least the same reasons as those discussed above.

Conclusion

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

Guillaume Bichot et al.

By: Paul P. Kiel
        Attorney for Applicants
        Registration No. 40,677

THOMSON Licensing LLC
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: Sept 18, 2007

8